



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,079	01/20/2000	David R. Montague	2779.2.2	3921

28049 7590 04/25/2002

PATE PIERCE & BAIRD
BANK ONE TOWER, SUITE 900
50 WEST BROADWAY
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

TESFAMARIAM, MUSSIE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

cd

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/488,079

Applicant(s)
David R. Montague

Examiner
Mussie Tesfamariam

Art Unit
3622



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 21, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: ~~2162~~ 3622

DETAILED ACTION

1. ~~Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.~~

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baron et al, 5809481 in view of Blum et al, 5805164 and Alexander et al, 6134593.

As per claim 1, Baron et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to a product; See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, the product having a surface associated therewith; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, and a computer-readable medium, storing instructions executable by a computer of a purchaser of the product, coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, col 6, lines 23-27, col 7, lines 14-18, col 9, lines 35-47. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a computer readable medium, storing instructions executable by a computer of a purchaser of the product, coupled to the product by the label. Blum et al disclose in

Art Unit: 2162

a computer readable medium, storing instructions executable by a computer of a purchaser of the product, coupled to the product by the label. See col 8, lines 13-15, 23-26, 47-57. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron to use a computer readable medium, storing instructions executable by a computer of a purchaser of the product. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have computerized labeling system. He specifically also fails to disclose in a label to be affixed at a source thereof. Alexander et al disclose in a label to be affixed at a source thereof. See col 6, lines 42-45. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron to use a label to be affixed at a source. This is because it would improve Baron's system to identify the affixed information at a source so the user can retrieve and install the information to his/her PC.

As per claim 8, Baron et al disclose in a hang tag, substantially enclosing the computer-readable medium. See the abstract, col 4, lines 28-30, 51-54, col 9, lines 31-32.

4. Claim 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baron et al, 5809481 in view of Blum et al, 5805164 and Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842.

As per claim 2, Baron et al disclose in marketing database printed in a spreadsheet format.

However, he fails specifically to disclose in the first information is printed on the label. Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the first information is printed on the label. See col 2, lines 14-17, col 3, lines

Art Unit: 2162

19-22. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will print the information on the label. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have visible information on the label.

As per claim 4, Baron et al disclose in the formats of display advertisement. See col 6, lines 28-30. However, he fails specifically to disclose in the label is shaped to provide the first information through a shape. Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the label is shaped to provide the first information through a shape. See fig 1a, fig 6, col 3, lines 9-15. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will provide the first information through a shape. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have easily available information through the shaped label.

5. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baron et al, 5809481 in view of Blum et al, 5805164 and Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Christensen et al, 5710886.

As per claim 5, Baron et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to a product; the product having a surface associated therewith; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, col 6, lines 23-27, col 7, lines 14-18, col 9, lines 35-47.

However, he fails to disclose in at least one of product facts, source facts, a test, a browser, a

Art Unit: 2162

launcher, and a network identifier. Christensen et al disclose in at least one of product facts, source facts, a test, a browser, a launcher, and a network identifier. See fig 6, fig 11, fig 12, col 8, lines 66-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will contain information mentioned in the above. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have vast gathering of information.

As per claim 6, Baron et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to a product; the product having a surface associated therewith; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, col 6, lines 23-27, col 7, lines 14-18, col 9, lines 35-47.

However, he fails to disclose in at least one of a garment, footwear, headgear, a foodstuff, furniture, an appliance, sporting goods, dry goods, a tool, and a plant. Christensen et al disclose in at least one of a garment, footwear, headgear, a foodstuff, furniture, an appliance, sporting goods, dry goods, a tool, and a plant. See fig 6, fig 12, fig 13, fig 14, column 1, lines 13-20, col 8, lines 58-62. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will contain information mentioned in the above. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have variety of product information.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 7, Baron et al disclose in the product to protect the label prior to purchase. See the abstract, col 6, lines 23-26.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baron et al, 5809481 in view of Blum et al, 5805164, Alexander et al, 6134593 and Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Markman, 5794213.

As per claim 3, Baron et al disclose in a label configured to be affixed to a product; the product having a surface associated therewith; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, col 6, lines 23-27, col 7, lines 14-18, col 9, lines 35-47. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a selection of color on the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 41-44, 56, col 3, lines 22-25. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will select color on the label. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have visible information on the label.

7. Claim 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baron et al, 5809481 in view of Blum et al, 5805164 and Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tsai et al, 5825292.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 9, disclose in a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, col 6, lines 23-27, col 7, lines 14-18, col 9, lines 35-47. However, he fails specifically to disclose in at least one of a printed medium, an electromagnetic medium, an optical medium, and a firmware medium. Tsai et al disclose in at least one of a printed medium, an electromagnetic medium, an optical medium, and a firmware medium. See the abstract, fig 1, col 1, lines 39-49, 62-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will include at least one of the mentioned medium in the above. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have different kinds of media.

As per claim 10, Baron et al disclose in a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 2, lines 18-10, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, col 6, lines 23-27, col 7, lines 14-18, col 9, lines 35-47. However, he fails specifically to disclose in at least one of the formats including compact disk, floppy disk, digital video disk, magnetic strip, bar code, symbolic code, and an embedded chip. Tsai et al disclose in at least one of the formats including compact disk, floppy disk, digital video disk, magnetic strip, bar code, symbolic code, and an embedded chip. See the abstract, fig 1, col 1, lines 19-14, 39-49, col 2, lines 1-1-10, 45-50. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will include at least one of the mentioned medium in the above. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have different kinds of media formatted in different ways.

Art Unit: 2162

8. Claims 11-12, 14, 18, 19, 21, 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 in view of Alexander et al, 6134593.

As per claim 11, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to packaging substantially enclosing a product, and the packaging having an exterior; see the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51. and the packaging substantially the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the packaging by the label and containing instructions executable on a computer of a user. See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51.

However, He specifically also fails to disclose in a label to be affixed at a source thereof.

Alexander et al disclose in a label to be affixed at a source thereof. See col 6, lines 42-45.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron to use a label to be affixed at a source. This is because it would improve Baron's system to identify the affixed information at a source so the user can retrieve and install the information to their PC.

As per claim 12, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the first information is printed on the label. See col 2, lines 15-17.

As per claim 14 Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the first information is printed on the label. See col 2, lines 14-17, col 3, lines 19-22, col 15, lines 24-27.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 18, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to a product, the product having an exterior; See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, the label configured to be attached to a tether having a first end and a second end; the first end configured to be coupled to the label; col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24 the second end configured to be coupled to the exterior of the product, such that the tether couples the label to the exterior of the product; col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51, the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, and a computer - readable medium coupled to the label and containing instructions executable of a computer of a user. See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51. However, He specifically also fails to disclose in a label to be affixed at a source thereof. Alexander et al disclose in a label to be affixed at a source thereof. See col 6, lines 42-45. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron to use a label to be affixed at a source. This is because it would improve Baron's system to identify the affixed information at a source so the user can retrieve and install the information to their PC.

As per claim 19, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the first information is printed on the label. See col 2, lines 15-17.

As per claim 21, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the first information is printed on the label. See col 2, lines 14-17, col 3, lines 19-22, col 15, lines 24-27.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 23, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose the product defines an opening into an interior of the product and at least part of the label is positioned in the interior of the product. See col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51.

As per claim 24, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in configuring a label to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of a product and a source of the product; coupling a computer-readable medium to the label; and coupling the label to an exterior of the product. See col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51.

As per claim 25, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the product is packaged. See col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67.

As per claim 26, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose in the label to the exterior of the product by a flexible member. See col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 in view of Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Markman, 5794213.

As per claim 13, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to packaging substantially enclosing a product, and the packaging having an exterior; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source

Art Unit: 2162

of the product; and the packaging substantially the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a selection of color on the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 41-44, 56, col 3, lines 22-25. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will select color on the label. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have visible information on the label.

10. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 in view of Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Christensen et al, 5710886.

As per claim 15, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to packaging substantially enclosing a product, and the packaging having an exterior; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; and the packaging substantially the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51. However, he fails to disclose in at least one of product facts, source facts, a test, a browser, a launcher, and a network identifier. Christensen et al disclose in at least one of product facts, source facts, a test, a browser, a launcher, and a network identifier. See fig 6, fig 11, fig 12, col 8, lines 66-67. Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2162

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will contain information mentioned in the above. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have vast gathering of information.

11. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 in view of Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Baron et al, 5809481.

As per claim 16, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to packaging substantially enclosing a product, and the packaging having an exterior; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; and the packaging substantially the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51. However, he fails to disclose in a hang tag, substantially enclosing the computer-readable medium. Baron et al disclose in a hang tag, substantially enclosing the computer-readable medium. See the abstract, col 4, lines 28-30, 51-54, col 9, lines 31-32. Therefore, it would have been obvious ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Dlugos, Sr. et al such that it will include a hanging tag. This is because it would improve Dlugos' system to have different kinds of tags.

Art Unit: 2162

12. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 in view of Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Tsai et al, 5825292.

As per claim 17, disclose in a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, fig 1, fig 2, col 4, lines 22-30, col 5, lines 48-51, col 6, lines 23-27, col 7, lines 14-18, col 9, lines 35-47. However, he fails specifically to disclose in at least one of a printed medium, an electromagnetic medium, an optical medium, and a firmware medium. Tsai et al disclose in at least one of a printed medium, an electromagnetic medium, an optical medium, and a firmware medium. See the abstract, fig 1, col 1, lines 39-49, 62-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will include at least one of the mentioned medium in the above. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have different kinds of media.

13. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 in view of Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Markman, 5794213.

As per claim 20, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to packaging substantially enclosing a product, and the packaging having an exterior; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; and the packaging substantially the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines

Art Unit: 2162

21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51. However, he fails specifically to disclose in a selection of color on the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 41-44, 56, col 3, lines 22-25.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Baron such that it will select color on the label. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have visible information on the label.

14. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dlugos, Sr. et al, 5153842 in view of Alexander et al, 6134593 as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Christensen et al, 5710886.

As per claim 22, Dlugos, Sr. et al disclose a label configured to be affixed to packaging substantially enclosing a product, and the packaging having an exterior; the label configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product; and the packaging substantially the product; and a computer-readable medium coupled to the product by the label. See the abstract, col 1, lines 1-10, 20-27, 60-67, col 2, lines 21-24, col 6, lines 34, col 7, lines 35, col 8, lines 43-51. However, he fails to disclose in at least one of product facts, source facts, a test, a browser, a launcher, and a network identifier. Christensen et al disclose in at least one of product facts, source facts, a test, a browser, a launcher, and a network identifier. See fig 6, fig 11, fig 12, col 8, lines 66-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2162

modify the system of Baron such that it will contain information mentioned in the above. This is because it would improve Baron's system to have vast gathering of information.

Conclusion

15. ~~The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.~~

A. ~~Pirelli, US Patent 5,611,051 March 11, 1997. Point of supply use distribution process and apparatus.~~

B. ~~Bowers et al, 6,195,006 August 27, 1999. Inventory system using articles with RFID TAGS.~~

~~Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mussie Tesfamariam whose telephone number is (703)305-1393. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the~~

Art Unit: 3622

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3622

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 03/21/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant's argues that the prior art Alexander recites "a product distribution identifier ...printed on a label affixed to a compact disc media storing the vendor software application" (Column 6, lines 42-45) The Examiner has simply provided a reference a compact disk media and a label and claims that this in combination with the Baron and Blum would produce Applicant's invention to "one of ordinary skill in the art." The Examiner agrees. But the prior art Alexander further disclose in a label configured to be affixed to a product and a computer readable medium. See col 10, lines 42-51. Therefore, the references cited are related arts, and as a result of that it would be obvious to combine to "one of ordinary skill in the art".

B. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11, and 18, the lack of Alexander to disclose "the labeling of a product". The Examiner disagrees. Because Alexander discloses in the labeling of CD media and the Examiner interprets CD as a product. See col 10, lines 42-51.

C. Applicant's arguments with respect to the lack of Baron to disclose "label configured to be affixed to a product." Baron explicitly disclose in a unique tag identifier which can be interpreted as a label, see the abstract and the label is executed in a computer readable medium. See col 7, lines 11-21, 41-47.

D. Applicant's arguments with respect to the lack of Baron or Blum to disclose "in a label

Art Unit: 3622

configured to be affixed to product at a source of and "configured to directly communicate first information corresponding to at least one of the product and a source of the product." See the reasons given in the above paragraph.

E. Applicant's arguments with respect to the lack of Baron to disclose in "any relationship between the information on the tag and the vendor of article to which the tag is attached". The Examiner disagrees. Because Baron explicitly discloses in a unique tag identifier attached with personal property item and in connection with that the use of an information storage and retrieval system will contact the person or the vendor. See the abstract.

F. Applicant's arguments with respect to the lack of Baron to disclose in "a computer readable medium, storing instructions executable computer of a purchaser of the product." The Examiner disagrees. Because Baron explicitly discloses in computer executable. See col 7, lines 11-21.

G. Applicant's argues that the prior art Blum is "inapposite art". The Examiner disagrees. Because the prior art, Blum discloses in a label to be executed in a computer readable medium. See col 8, lines 31-57). Therefore it is relevant art.

H. Applicant's arguments with respect to the lack of Dlugos to disclose in "a computer-readable medium coupled to the packaging he label and containing instructions executable on a computer of a user." The Examiner disagrees. Because Dlugos explicitly disclose in a label affixed to a product to be executed in a computer-readable medium. See col 1, lines 36-41, 60-63, col 6, lines 30-38. Therefore, it is construed to be identical in structure and function to the claimed invention. Therefore, all dependent claims are rejected due to their dependency on the rejected base claims.

Art Unit: 3622

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. Pirelli, US Patent 5,611,051 March 11, 1997. Point of supply use distribution process and apparatus.

B. Bowers et al, 6,195,006 August 27, 1999. Inventory system using articles with RFID TAGS.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mussie Tesfamariam** whose telephone number is **(703)305-1393**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the **examiner's supervisor, Eric stamber** can be reached at **(703) 305-8469**.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or **faxed to:**

(703)746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Application/Control Number: 09488079

Page 20

Art Unit: 3622

Or:

(703)746-7240, (for informal or draft communications, please label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

or

(703)746-7238, (for After-final)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to **Crystal park II, 2121 Crystal**

Drive

Arlington, Virginia, (Receptionist).

Mussie Tesfamariam

April 22, 2002

*Star Gravini
for GWS*

**STEPHEN GRAVINI
PRIMARY EXAMINER**